

137825-1

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 50 and 52 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, 29, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, and 52 have been amended, Claims 54 – 58 have been added, Claims 1 – 23, 25 – 50, and 52 have been allowed, leaving Claims 24 and 54 – 58 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment.

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, 29, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, and 52 have been amended to make the language throughout the claims consistent; e.g., to change “at least one” to “a” or “an”, since “a” and “an” mean at least one.

Claims 26 and 52 have been further amended merely for clarity and to remove unnecessary language.

Claims 54 - 56 have been added to further claim the present invention. Support for this new claim can at least be found in Claim 24 as originally filed as well as in Paragraph [0052] as originally filed.

Claims 57 and 58 have been added to further claim the present invention. Support for this new claim can at least be found in Claims 1, 26, and 52 as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments or new claims. These amendment do not narrow the claim scope and were not introduced to overcome prior art. The amendment merely address grammar and consistency of language. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants note that the Examiner has not considered the art submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 28, 2005. Applicants respectfully request that the art submitted in this Information Disclosure Statement be considered and a fully initialed PTO Form 1449 be returned to the Applicants.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

137825-1

the invention. In particular, "following curing of the substrate layer..." is allegedly unclear terminology since the substrate layer is claimed as uncured, therefore the curing process thereafter lacks antecedent basis.

Applicants note that Claim 24 depends from Claim 1. Claim 1 is directed to an article that comprises multiple layers, with the substrate layer being an uncured thermoset or uncured cyclic oligomer. Claim 1 does not restrict the multilayer article from thereafter being cured. In other words, Claim 1 requires the coating layer to be in contiguous contact with the second layer, and the adhesive layer to be in contiguous contact with the second layer and the substrate layer, wherein the substrate layer is an uncured thermoset or uncured cyclic oligomer. Since the multilayer article comprises the above elements, once this has occurred, the claim is met. Thereafter, the coating can be cured, e.g., see Paragraph [0049]. Claim 24 is directed to the multilayer article after curing.

Additionally, Claim 24 does not state following "the" curing, because there is no antecedent basis for "the curing". Claim 24 states "following curing".

Applicants contend that Claim 24 is clear and definite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.


It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the case are respectfully requested.

137825-1

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-3621.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 
Pamela J. Curbelo
Registration No. 34,676

Date: November 16, 2005
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413